



Project Team

Congestion Relief & Bus Rapid Transit Projects

600 – 108th Avenue NE, Suite 405
Bellevue, WA 98004
Main 425-456-8500
Fax 425-456-8600

August 12, 2005

Request For Proposals
I-405, SR 520 to SR 522 Stage 1
Design-Build Project

ATTENTION: All Short-listed Proposers

Response To Questions No. 2

1. **Question:** Chapter 2 Technical Provisions, Section 2.16.4.1.4, paragraph three, calls for the DB to supply and install square decorative light standards. We believe this may be in error, and that only the fixture is to be square and decorative. This would follow what is installed in the area, and what is being installed on the Totem Lake project. We believe the pole it self should be round, galvanized, state standard.

Response: Per RFP Addendum #2, light standards shall be in accordance with Section 8-20.2 of the Special Provisions, RFP Appendix B1. The requirements for painting the poles will remain.

2. **Question:** In the Conceptual Plans, Appendix M1, ITS plan sheet IT5, sheet 66 of 81, the north bound off ramp to NE 116th, approximate station 145 of the off ramp, the plan indicates to install a state supplied control cabinet, yet the type of cabinet and / or the purpose of this cabinet is not clear. Can the owner provide input on what their intent was with this cabinet?

Response: The cabinet along the NB off-ramp was intended as a data station cabinet to accommodate the additional loops. It would be acceptable not to include the cabinet if it is shown that the proposed design can accommodate the additional loops and provide for Forward Compatibility without it.



3. **Question:** Does the Totem Lake Blvd Advance Guide sign at approx. NB405 Line Sta. 4180+00 RT (see sheet 69/80) need to be replaced by a "NE 116th St", "NE 124th St.", and "Totem Lake Blvd" Advance Guide sign with an "Exit Only" panel? Per the MUTCD Section 2E.30 Advance Guide sign shall be placed 0.5 miles and 1 mile in an advance of the exit. If so, this would require a cantilever sign structure, do you agree?

Response: Evaluating the configuration between these interchanges it is not necessary to include an additional overhead sign for the exit. The sign at approx. NB 405 Sta 4148+50 provides a one mile advance sign for the NE 116th St and NE 124th St exits, the two major destinations. The sign at approx. NB 405 Sta 4204+50 RT is approximately 0.37 miles in advance of the exit to NE 124th St with the lane drop configuration. The sign at approx. NB 405 Sta 4180+00 is a supplemental guide sign to identify that Totem Lake Blvd traffic should use the NE 124th St exit, supplemental signs should be ground mounted.

4. **Question:** Should the Advance Guide sign for Exit 20 A-B at approx. NB405 Line Sta. 4148+50 RT (see sheet 67/80) include "Totem Lake Blvd" in the exit description?

Response: Per Section V.D. of the Northwest Region Current Practices Manual for sign design, "Guide signs are limited to two destinations and directional copy not exceeding three lines, which may include symbols, route numbers, arrows, cardinal direction, and the action message." Including "Totem Lake Blvd" on the exit sequence signs would not comply with this requirement. Therefore, the supplemental guide sign was added for Totem Lake Blvd.

5. **Question:** In regard to noise wall U4:

1. Wall U4 is a 400' replacement section wall in the middle of a 2,785' existing noise wall. What are the surface treatment requirements for the replacement section? The existing wall has fractured fin on the freeway side and smooth on the back.
2. What is the elevation difference at each end of the wall, compared to the existing wall - e.g. what is the vertical difference between the two. Is there a detail for stepping the new wall down to the existing?

Response:

1. The surface treatments for this wall replacement should match the existing surface treatments, front and back, and including top caps.
2. The new wall is 3 feet taller than existing on the south end, and 9 feet taller than existing on the north end. The Proposer shall detail the end treatments to join the existing wall. Vertical steps shall be a 2-foot maximum and occur at 8-foot minimum intervals. The length of the wall replacement will increase from the 400-feet shown in the Conceptual Plans.

The information provided in this response is included in RFP Addendum #2.

6. **Question:** We request a design criteria clarification for the detention facility to be located at Pond B4 shown on drawing DR1. Pond B4 cannot be built within the designated right-of-way as presented in the RFP conceptual design drawings. Will WSDOT require a vault structure or pump lift station to be constructed.

Response: The storm drainage configuration shown on the Kirkland Stage 1 plans for TDA-B4 represents one conceptual design alternative for stormwater management within this basin. Equivalent alternatives and their variations are acceptable and encouraged where alternate means yield improved designs and/or life-cycle cost savings. It is assumed that the use of a pump lift station is not necessary and would be unacceptable in the final design.

7. **Question:** Regarding Retaining Wall RW 3005: The profile for RW 3005, on WSDOT Conceptual Plan RWP1, and the section on RWP2, show an integral traffic barrier. Based on our understanding of the Kirkland Stage 1 requirements, the fill behind (traffic side) this retaining wall will not occur until the Kirkland Stage 2 project is complete. This will result in this barrier being significantly above the Stage 1 finish grades at the back face of wall. Would a retaining wall without an integral traffic barrier be acceptable? A single faced barrier could be placed in front of the wall, at the correct elevation, as part of the Stage 2 construction.

Response: Requirements for the design and construction of wall RW 3005 have been added to the RFP. See RFP Addendum #2, item 36.

8. **Question:** Thank you for your clarification of Addendum 2 Item 36 - the intent is to construct wall 3005 at the location shown in Appendix M1 with the design elements required in the Implementation Plan.

The Implementation Plans show that in a future contract the southern third or so of wall 3005 will need to be demolished and reconstructed to the east outside of current WSDOT right-of-way in the Implementation Plan to accommodate the 85th intersection ramp alignment.

Addendum #2, Item #36: "Section 2.11.4, Design and Construction Criteria, is supplemented with the following: 2.11.4.1.14 Retaining Wall 3005 Retaining wall 3005 shall be designed according to Section 2.13 to accommodate the highway and embankment loading for the Implementation Plan roadway. The top of retaining wall/bottom of noise wall interface shall be set to the top of concrete barrier that will be required for the Implementation Plan roadway. The retaining wall shall be designed and constructed to support the impact loading on the barrier. The embankment constructed between the edge of pavement and the face of wall as a part of Kirkland Stage 1 shall be compatible with the Implementation Plan finished grade."

Please confirm this interpretation.

Response: Retaining Wall 3005 (RW 3005) shall be constructed integral with Noise Wall R2B (NW R2B) and within 5-feet of the easterly Right-of-Way limits. With regard to the southern terminus of this wall, RW 3005 is expected to terminate at the location where the Implementation roadway would force the wall out of the right of way. South of this point, RW 3005 should be continued to the extent required for construction of the Kirkland Stage 1 Contract. NW R2B shall continue to the limits shown on the Conceptual Plans with the acknowledgement that this southern portion will be demolished and reconstructed in a future contract.

9. **Question:** With regard to the Kuney Schedule activities for the Totem Lake project:

Several activities related to asphalt paving are within the "wearing course weather restriction" for paving; WSDOT Standard 5-04.3(16) - HMA for wearing course shall not be placed on any traveled way between October 1 of any year and April 1 of the following year without written approval from the Project Engineer.

The activities only describe "full depth" paving and we have not found any other activities that indicate the wearing course will be placed later.

Please confirm the activities described as "full Depth" paving include the final wearing course. If these activities do not include the final wearing course, please provide the final wearing course schedule

Response: This is an outstanding issue in the Totem Lake Contract schedule approval. An updated schedule will be provided to the Proposers/Design-Builder as better information becomes available.

10. **Question:** Please provide an as-built profile of the existing 72" Kirkland sanitary sewer south of NE 116th Street.

Please provide as-built pile tip elevations for the H piling shown on Appendix N sheets 337 and 343.

Response: This information is added to the RFP by RFP Addendum #2 as Appendices U1 and N respectively. In addition, the location of the 72" Sewer has been updated in Appendix A2. This data is included in Addendum #3.

11. **Question:** We have been unable to find the electronic reference file "Kirkland UT 3ex159a250d.ut.dgn". This file is listed in the note on the Existing Utility Conflicts drawing in Appendix U3.

We're looking for details on the 72" King County Sewer.

Response: The 72" Sewer data has been revised in the electronic file 3ex157a251d_bm.dgn. The updated 3ex157a251d_bm.dgn is included in Addendum #3.

12. **Question:** We have obtained the as-built drawings for the King County/METRO 72" sanitary sewer that was installed in 1970 along the right of way line at 120th Ave NE. These drawings have very accurate locations for all angle points in the sewer and we have converted the King County datum to the I405 project datum. METRO manhole locations match field survey locations. It appears that 72" sanitary sewer was rotated incorrectly into the WSDOT base map near Vault C1.2 and where it crosses 120th Avenue NE. The difference between the WSDOT base map and the METRO drawing location is over the ten foot horizontal "Reasonable Accuracy Limit" described in the General Provisions 1-07.17(9).2 and impacts the proposed construction of Vault C1.2.

Additionally, the existing 24" storm drain that crosses under the 72" sanitary sewer was constructed as an inverted siphon. The proposed Vault C1.2 outlet and bypass piping around Vault C1.2 would also need to be constructed as inverted siphons under the 72" sanitary sewer. Please confirm that an inverted siphon is acceptable at these locations or if you would prefer to have a pump lift station constructed.

Response: The 72" Sewer data has been revised in the electronic file 3ex157a251d_bm.dgn. The updated 3ex157a251d_bm.dgn is included in Addendum #3.

The apparent conflict with the Vault C1.2 outlet is addressed in RFP Addendum #2, Item #37 and Addendum #3, Item 40.

13. **Question:** It appears that a palustrine emergent wetland is located on the west side of I-405, in and north of the proposed Detention Pond C1.1 (see DR4 sheet 41 of 80). This wetland area was not shown on the base map or described in the wetland delineation reports and it appears to cover approximately 1/3 of the northern portion of Detention Pond C1.1 and into the slope north of the culvert area. Was this wetland identified during field work and determined not to meet wetland criteria? Or is this a new wetland that was inadvertently missed during original field assessment? If this is a regulated wetland, how does WSDOT want to handle the potential addition of wetland impact and mitigation?

Response: Two wetlands were inadvertently missed during original field assessment. These wetlands have been delineated and added to the base map information, included in Addendum #3.

Brian Nielsen
Contract Manager